

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2005, which rejected claims 1, 2 and 19, objected to claims 3-10 and 20-24, and withdrew from further consideration method claims 11-18.

The Applicant has hereinabove presented amendments to cancel claims 19-24 without prejudice and to add new claims 25-27 in substitution therefor. As with cancelled claim 19, newly added claim 25 is a product by process claim that links the inventions of Groups I and II. Support for newly added claim 25 includes the original language of claims 1 and 11. Support for newly added claims 26 and 27 includes the original language of claims 2 and 12, respectively.

The Applicant hereby identifies newly added claims 25-27 as at least readable upon the invention of Group I. As claim 25 is a proper linking claim pursuant to MPEP 809.03, upon allowance of claim 25, the Applicant is entitled to further consideration of withdrawn claims 11-18.

The foregoing amendments are believed to be proper, do not introduce new matter, and serve to place the application in proper condition for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 22-24 were objected to because of an informality with regard to the preambles of these claims. The above cancellation of these claims is believed to obviate this objection. The Applicant apologizes for any inconvenience to the Examiner that was caused by this inadvertent error.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,426,847 to Dague et al. ("Dague '847"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner stated that, "a portion of the platform 120 can be considered the rigid structural component." While the Applicant respectfully traverses this conclusion, the Applicant submits that such characterization, even if valid, is insufficient to establish anticipation of claim 1 by Dague '847 since all limitations in claim 1 are not disclosed explicitly or inherently by Dague '847.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a platform portion supporting an over-mold portion." The over-mold portion, in turn, comprises two components: "at least one rigid structural component and a concurrently formed elastomeric component."

Dague '847 is at least silent with regard to disclosing the recited "elastomeric component" of the recited "over-mold portion." Dague '847 discloses a platform portion 120 onto which are formed over-mold portions 104, 105. The over-mold portions 104, 105 are disclosed as comprising the same type of over-mold material, and further both are described as comprising rigid structural components. See e.g., col. 3, lines 39-58; FIGS. 3-4.

The Applicant thus submits that the Examiner has failed to show how that Dague '847 discloses over-mold portions including a rigid structural component and an elastomeric component, as claimed.

Moreover, it is inappropriate to characterize a portion of the platform 120 in Dague '847 as the rigid structural component, since one skilled in the art would instead clearly identify the platform 120 as not being an over-mold portion.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 are therefore respectfully requested on this basis.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2 and 19 were further rejected as being obvious over Dague '847 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,537 to Kimura et al. ("Kimura '537"). This is respectfully traversed. As claim 19 has been cancelled, the rejection will be discussed in view of remaining claims 1 and 2.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Kimura '537 fails to make up for the above deficiencies of Dague '847, as Kimura '537 further fails to teach or suggest an over-mold portion comprising an elastomeric material, as featured by claim 1. Rather, it is clear that Kimura '537 teaches and suggests the over-molding of rigid structural material in order to form a housing for an integrated circuit. See e.g., col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 5.

Since teachings or suggestions for all of the limitations of claim 1 have not been accounted for, the rejection under §103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims 25-27

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111, newly added claims 25-27 are likewise believed to define subject matter that is patentable over the prior art for the same reasons presented above. That is, the art of record alone or in combination at least fail to disclose, teach or suggest an over-mold portion comprising a rigid structural component and an elastomeric component, as set forth by claim 25. Claims 26 and 27 are likewise believed patentable as depending from a patentable base claim.

Conclusion

This is intended to be a complete response to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 25-27 are respectfully requested. Moreover, upon allowance of linking claim 25, the Applicant requests consideration and allowance of withdrawn claims 11-18.

Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below signed attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens, P.C.
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659
Customer No. 33900